



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|---|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/728,890 | 12/08/2003 | Francois Cottard | 06028.0031-00 | 9673 |
| 22852 | 7590 | 06/28/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| | | FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 | ELHILO, EISA B | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1751 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/728,890 | COTTARD ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Eisa B. Elhilo | 1751 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15,34-38,47,48 and 51-94 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15,34-38,47-48 and 51-94 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- 1 This action is responsive to the amendment filed on May 1, 2006.
- 2 The cancellation of claims 16-33, 39-46 and 49-50 is acknowledged. Pending claims are 1-15, 34-38, 47-48 and 51-94.
- 3 The rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph is rendered moot because of the cancellation of the claim 29 by applicant's amendment.
- 4 The rejection of claims 1-9, 14-15, 34-35, 47-48, 53-73 and 75-94 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cottard et al. (US' 514 A1) for the reasons set forth in the previous office action mailed on November 29, 2005.
- 5 Claim 74 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cottard et al. (US' 514 A1) for the reasons set forth in the previous office action mailed on November 29, 2005.
- 6 Claims 10-13 and 51-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cottard et al. (US' 514 A1) in view of Eteve et al. (US' 955) for the reasons set forth in the previous office action mailed on November 29, 2005.
- 7 Claims 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cottard et al. (US' 514 A1) in view of Laurent et al. (US' 431 A1) for the reasons set forth in the previous office action mailed on November 29, 2005.

Response to Applicant's amendment Arguments

- 8 Applicant's arguments filed 5,1,2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-9, 14-15, 34-35, 47-48, 53-73 and 75-94 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cottard et al. (US' 514 A1), Applicant argues that Cottard fails to teach a composition wherein all of the elements are present and arranged as required by the claim. Applicant also argues that Cottard's only Example fails to disclose a composition as claimed.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above arguments because the use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain. "*In re Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)). Further, a reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art, including non-preferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed.Cir.), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 975 (1989). Further, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegeaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 824 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "When a claim covers several structures or compositions, either generically or as alternatives, the claim is deemed anticipated if any of the structures or compositions within the scope of the claims is known in the prior art." *Brown v. 3M*, 265 F.3d 1349, 1351, 60 USPQ2d 1375, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001). In this case Cottard et al. (US' 514 A1) clearly teaches a composition comprising oxidation bases (see page 6, formula I), fatty alcohols (see page 17, paragraph, 0347), fatty acid

esters (see page 16, paragraph, 0324) and associative polymers of the amended claims (see page 4, paragraphs 0077-0080). Therefore, the rejection under 102(b) is proper and maintained.

With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cottard et al., unpatentable over Cottard et al. in view of Eteve and unpatentable over Cottard et al. in view of Laurent et al. Applicant argues that there are no *prima facie* cases of obviousness have been established in these rejections.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above arguments for the same reasons as mentioned above.

9 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eisa B. Elhilo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1315. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (8:00 -5:30) with alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Eisa Elhilo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

June 24, 2006